

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 876

HE 024 083

AUTHOR Shalala, Donna E.; And Others
TITLE Mandate for a New Century: Reshaping the Research University's Role in Social Policy. Eleventh David Dodds Henry Lecture.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Urbana.
PUB DATE 31 Oct 89
NOTE 57p.; Speech given at the University of Urbana-Champaign (Urbana, IL, October 31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Higher Education; *Institutional Role; *Policy Formation; *Problem Solving; *Research Needs; Research Universities; Research Utilization; Scientific Methodology; *Social Problems; Social Studies; Speeches

ABSTRACT

A speech by Chancellor Donna E. Shalala of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, is presented; it calls for a broadening university commitment to societal issues and for the university to engage in basic research on social policy issues in a fashion similar to the fundamental science and technology research currently undertaken. The lecture articulates a vision of the land-grant mission for public research universities of the 21st century and also calls for the research university, receiving funding from the general public, to work with a greater sense of public service in helping society to grow healthy and prosperous. In addition to the speech, three responses by administrators and scholars from the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign are provided, as well as questions from the audience, and Chancellor Shalala's responses to these questions. The formal responses are from the following personnel at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign campus: Morton W. Weir, Chancellor of the university; P. David Pearson, Dean, College of Education; and Dianne M. Pinderhughes, Associate Professor of Political Science and Acting Director, Afro-American Studies and Research Program. (GLR)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED334876

MANDATE FOR A NEW CENTURY:

Reshaping the Research University's Role in Social Policy

by Donna E. Shalala

Chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Madison

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Univ. of Illinois

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Eleventh David Dodds Henry Lecture

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

HE 024 083

The David Dodds Henry Lectures in Higher Education

are endowed by gifts to the University of Illinois Foundation in recognition of Dr. Henry's contributions to the administration of higher education, including his career as president of the University of Illinois from 1955 until 1971. The lectures are intended to focus upon the study of the organization, structure, or administration of higher education, as well as its practice. Selection of persons to present the lectures is the responsibility of the chancellors of the two campuses of the University. Presentation of the lectures is alternated between Chicago and Urbana-Champaign.

MANDATE FOR A NEW CENTURY:

Reshaping the Research University's Role in Social Policy



DAVID DODDS HENRY
President, University of Illinois
1955-71

MANDATE FOR A NEW CENTURY:

Reshaping the Research University's Role in Social Policy

by Donna E. Shalala

Chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Eleventh David Dodds Henry Lecture

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

October 31, 1989

Produced for the Office of the President by the Office of Publications, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Frontispiece by Jack Davis. 130.17
The University of Illinois is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution.

CONTENTS

Preface, Paul W. Thurston

vii

Introduction, Stanley O. Ikenberry

1

Mandate for a New Century:
Reshaping the Research University's Role
in Social Policy, Donna E. Shalala

3

Response, Morton W. Weir

20

Response, P. David Pearson

24

Response, Dianne M. Pinderhughes

30

Questions and Discussion

35

List of David Dodds Henry Lectures

48

P R E F A C E

The David Dodds Henry Lectures at the University of Illinois were established by friends of the University to honor President Henry. Seventeen years ago, Clark Kerr gave the first lecture, "The Administration of Higher Education in an Era of Change and Conflict." Donna Shalala, chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, continues the tradition with the eleventh lecture, "Mandate for a New Century: Reshaping the Research University's Role in Social Policy."

Chancellor Shalala calls for a broadening university commitment to societal issues. This call is for the university to engage in basic research on social policy issues in a fashion similar to the fundamental science and technology research currently undertaken. This lecture articulates a vision of the land-grant mission for public research universities of the twenty-first century that is provocative and controversial.

The monograph is organized to include the rich dialogue that took place October 31, 1989, at this public lecture. Following the Shalala lecture are three responses by administrators and scholars from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, questions from the audience, and responses to these questions.

Paul W. Thurston, *editor*
Associate Professor and Head,
Department of Administration
Higher, and Continuing Education
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

INTRODUCTION

Our speaker today is especially well equipped to deliver the eleventh Henry lecture. I recall not quite two years ago when Donna Shalala arrived at Madison. She brought a fresh perspective and a breath of fresh air — with the force of a whirlwind. Those two years have been jam-packed with innovative, creative, forceful leadership, not seen on many other campuses across the country. A lot has been going on at Wisconsin.

The "Madison Plan" to diversify that campus environment so as to reflect the diversity of the pluralistic society and to recruit larger numbers of minority students and faculty and staff members at Madison has been implemented. Several new teaching and research initiatives at Madison have been initiated during the last two years. A thorough reexamination, reshaping, and restatement of academic priorities has begun. A fire was lit to ignite private fund-raising efforts. The "Wisconsin idea" — the idea, the very basic notion that a university ought to be fundamentally useful to the people of the state in countless ways — has been revitalized and reemphasized at Wisconsin.

Chancellor Shalala has given vigorous leadership on the national level as well, including the troubled vineyard of intercollegiate athletics. She is an active member of the Council of Ten, and on the national level she has been appointed to the recently formed commission sponsored by the Knight Foundation and cochaired by Ted Hesburgh and Bill Friday to examine and lead a national reform movement for intercollegiate athletics in this country. She is a very frequent spokesperson for higher education.

One could have predicted that Donna Shalala would pursue a rather broad-gauged notion about what higher education leadership is all about. Her entire life has been one of public service, including in the Peace

Corps, through leadership as a member of the rescue squad that saved New York City from its "Big Mac" fiscal attack of several years ago, and in countless other ways.

In addition to her record of public service in government at the state, local, and national levels, Donna Shalala has been a productive scholar and writer in the fields of government, finance, and public policy. She has enjoyed a productive academic career, including membership on the faculty at Columbia and as president of Hunter College from 1980 until she assumed her current responsibilities at Madison. She is a member of the National Academy of Education and the National Academy of Public Administration, has received more than a dozen honorary degrees, and, I must tell you, is highly respected by her colleagues. It is an honor and a privilege to introduce her as our speaker for this, the eleventh David Dodds Henry Lectureship. Dr. Shalala

Stanley O. Ikenberry
President,
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

MANDATE FOR A NEW CENTURY:

Reshaping the Research University's Role in Social Policy

by Donna E. Shalala

Chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Madison

It's a great pleasure to be with you here today. It is an honor to give a lecture named for one of the great leaders of higher education — David Dodds Henry.

I'm assuming it's just a coincidence that you asked me to come and give this lecture on Halloween. But it's actually appropriate because I intend to talk to you today about changing guises — about the need to change the shape and mien of our nation's research universities and to cast them in some new roles. To achieve this will require our best thinking. It will require creativity, guile, and new reward systems; it will require all of our "tricks" and all of our "treats."

This fall, I've been doing some reading. I've just finished Neil Sheehan's beautiful, heartbreaking book about Vietnam, *A Bright Shining Lie*. As you probably know, it's based on the life of General John Vann. John Vann had plenty of problems in the military and in his personal life as an adult. But he also had a singularly miserable life as a child. His parentage was ambiguous, and he and his brothers and sisters very often wore the next thing up from rags and had little to eat. When they did have enough to eat, one of their favorite hardscrabble meals was fried potatoes and cheese biscuits. That's it. Just fried potatoes and cheese biscuits, and

hope you had enough to fill you up. Now this is as good a description as I've ever seen of what medical historians call the urban rickets diet. It was different from the rural rickets diet, which was also terribly mean, but which at least offered people two seasons of meals that included vegetables from their kitchen gardens. The Vann family had no garden, and so the danger of rickets from a critical shortage of vitamin D loomed very large for them. And in fact, one of the Vann children, John's brother Eugene, the youngest and most vulnerable, did suffer a very serious case of rickets. He was only three.

Rickets is not something that many of us, especially those under forty, have seen in our lifetimes, at least in the United States. We have reason to be grateful that we have not seen it, because it's a horrible and grotesque disease that twists and wrenches growing young limbs into nightmare shapes. Eugene Vann's legs were so bowed that it was said he could step over a nail keg without noticing it. A public health nurse intervened, and she arranged for surgeons to painstakingly break and reset every single bone in both of Eugene Vann's legs over a period of years. He was badly scarred, spent eight months in a body cast, and suffered painful arthritis all of his life. But he was one of the lucky ones. Many thousands of other children were not so lucky.

I read the section of Sheehan's book that talks about Eugene Vann's fate with particular interest because juvenile rickets has a connection with my university. Rickets virtually no longer exists in the United States. It no longer exists — this horrible crippler, this robber of childhood speed and grace — because of a wonderful discovery, a gift of science. In 1924, Professor Harry Steenbock of the University of Wisconsin-Madison discovered a process for the production and storage of vitamin D in foods as a result of exposing them to ultraviolet radiation. That process led to the

common availability of vitamin D-enriched milk, and rickets, in this country at least, was eliminated in the space of a generation.

This is a story told over and over again. I can look around me and see many monuments to the way that research in the pure sciences has bettered the lot of humankind, literally saved humankind from the worst terrors. Down the road from my office, the most powerful rat poison ever known — warfarin — was developed, and it helped take down those dangerous and disease-ridden pests that plagued our cities. That is, until the rats started thriving on the stuff. But warfarin is still used — now to prevent blood clotting in human heart vessels. Our great research universities have done an astonishing job of transferring their knowledge of science and technology to society at large, and done so, I might add, with a fair amount of class, compassion, integrity, and humility. Without even venturing beyond our Big Ten universities, we find, well, right here at the University of Illinois, as you all know, a development in 1922 that profoundly affected the lives of every single American. And that was the development of sound on film, without which there would never have been something like *Back to School* or *Goodbye Mr. Chips* — but also *Dead Poets Society* and *The Thin Blue Line* and *Casablanca*. Here, too, one finds . . . PLATO, the first computer-aided instructional system . . . the discovery of archaeobacteria, “the third form of life” . . . and the development of the theory of superconductivity for which University of Illinois researchers received the Nobel Prize.

Not far away, at Michigan State, scientists developed cisplatin, the most widely used cancer-fighting drug in the world. The first corn hybrids. Insecticide that killed bugs without destroying the environment around them. There, too, scientists created the process for chrome plating, making that classy chrome trim that was, for so many years, the hallmark of a

Detroit automobile. And Professor Robert Kedzie's work in ending the practice of selling wallpaper with dangerous arsenic in the fiber, and eliminating the kind of kerosene that was so explosive it could make lamps into bombs.

So very much was changed for good in the course of a century. I don't even have to think very hard to come up with a long list of examples. The Ames Test out of the University of California-Berkeley, that made it possible to detect whether the chemicals we come in contact with every day will cause cancer in our bodies or birth defects in our unborn children. And the list of accomplishments goes on and on. Establishing the basis for wildlife ecology and conservation. And the basis for travel in space and planetary exploration. Understanding the brain hormones that rule growth, and the biology of aging. Creating technologies that revolutionized farming. Developing the ability to transplant major organs. All of these discoveries and thousands more have emerged from our great research universities — all in 100 years. Making this 100 years a century of light and learning.

Beyond question, the scientific research done under the sheltering arms of research universities has improved human life, prolonged human life, enriched and protected and comforted human life. The great plagues are basically behind us. Even the one that frightens us most — AIDS — is preventable, and research carried out in large part by university scientists is under way to prevent and treat it. We are chipping away at the great killers that shorten productive lives. We have made sure, at least in theory, that every American has a chance at a healthy life and enough to eat. And these are pretty astonishing assurances as one looks at our neighbors around the globe.

Some of the most progressive social reforms in this century also

have originated in research universities. In 1912, a historian named Charles McCarthy wrote a book called *The Wisconsin Idea*. He's called the father of the idea, but actually the concept had been around for a few years before his book appeared. At the turn of the century, one of my predecessors expressed the philosophy that the "walls of the university should be the boundaries of the state." Now, as we approach the turn of another century, the "Wisconsin Idea" has come to mean an implicit cooperation and alliance between the state university and the citizens of the state. In other words, in recognition of support from the state's taxpayers, the university is imbued with a sense of public service — its faculty and staff are engaged in an extraordinary number of activities and programs that return benefits to the state's citizens.

Over the decades, this concept has grown strong and deep into the marrow of American higher education. It has been expanded and adapted and incorporated as a fundamental mission at most public universities and many private ones. But imagine how astounding this concept must have seemed at the beginning. What a break with the classical tradition of higher education: the idea that a goal of a great university — and a primary goal at that — could be public service. This was very different. This was unheard of. Universities were places for the elite. As we all know, under the European model, the goal of a university was the transfer of culture. In the German model, it was scholarship, scholarship carried out for the benefit of the advantaged few.

Here was this brash, homespun, quite radical, Midwestern notion that the work in agriculture and chemistry and economics at a great public university could be used — by design, not by accident. And that universities could be agents to improve lives outside the halls of learning. In Wisconsin, it meant saving the state's cabbage industry by taking the very

last surviving head of cabbage and using it to create a new breed that could survive a fast-moving disease. It meant making arable land of the "sand counties" that the environmentalist Aldo Leopold wrote about, using a new process called wide-ranging irrigation, a process that would ultimately reach around the world and turn dusty wasteland into farmland. It meant reducing the cost of penicillin from sixty dollars a dose to twelve cents a dose by refining the process of making it. It meant having professors go into manufacturing plants to teach courses in the latest engineering and management techniques — techniques that saved industries millions of dollars. And it meant faculty involvement in shaping social institutions and social policy.

Charles McCarthy, who coined the term *Wisconsin Idea*, started the ball rolling by setting up the legislative reference library — a library for legislators, staffed by university librarians. It was intended to blunt what McCarthy saw as the corrupting influence of lobbyists and to encourage lawmakers to call on librarians to help them draft their bills. University faculty members were quickly brought in to participate in a startling series of government reforms. In Wisconsin, economists and social scientists took leaves, and worked in state government to set up the nation's first worker's compensation programs, the first public service regulatory agency, the first social security program. There were other reforms. The first civil service system came out of Wisconsin, as did election by the primary system and the progressive income tax. These were ideas that were rapidly adopted by the federal government.

As you know, this amount of influence on the law by nonlaw-makers was very controversial. At one point, a critic suggested it smacked of socialism. He said: "We're in danger of becoming a university state instead of a state university." But despite its critics, the Wisconsin Idea has

worked for a good long time, because its goals have been popular beyond party lines, beyond politics. The idea of a disinterested technocratic elite, as it were — the state's best and brightest working for all — was so appealing that even after "Fighting Bob" LaFollette's Progressives became history, the tradition that universities could improve the quality of life persisted.

It persisted because everyone—farmers and professors and business owners and politicians and homemakers and workers — basically agreed on some important ideas: That those *without* wealth and power must be protected. That government must be open. That there must be some social control over those with huge economic strength. And that the government ought to be used as a tool to achieve social equity — to level the playing field for everyone. All acknowledged that the university's experts could help secure these goals. And the rightness of those goals was held to be a notion that transcended politics.

That tradition is a beacon to us as we approach the threshold of the twenty-first century. We must not be complacent. We must not think that ours is a job of fine-tuning, of civilizing already explored frontiers. In fact, the research university has a tremendous basic job of discovery before it. We have doors to open for which we have not yet found the keys.

Not long ago I read a news article about a social worker named Nancy Townsend who visited the home of a young mother named Patricia. Patricia is fifteen years old. She lives with her mother, who's only thirty-one years old. Patricia's mother has four other children, and her mother's boyfriend lives in the house, too. Patricia has two children of her own, both still in diapers. She was seven months pregnant at the time of the story. By now, she very likely has a third baby. This is what the reporter wrote:

Patricia is pale, and there are bags under her eyes. Her legs have sores, some scratched open. She says they are

from chicken pox, which she had at the beginning of this pregnancy. . . . There is no formula in the house for the baby. . . . She simply can't say just how long it has been since she has seen her mother. Roaches roam the living room walls and floor. Two single mattresses lie on the floor, looking as though motor oil has been spilled on them. They are torn in several places. A large double bed fills one room. Lying on the stained mattress, against the wall, is a ragged copy of a Little Golden Book, *The Very Best Home for Me*.

He went on to write: "No one has been evicted from this house. No one has died here. This house never has been in the headlines."

It is, by implication, just business as usual in a not even particularly tough part of a Midwestern city. Earlier in the same week, in the same newspaper, the annual figures from the city's Health and Social Services Department showed that 51 percent of that city's babies were born to single mothers. Nearly 90 percent of all of the black newborns in that city were born to single mothers in this not particularly troubled, relatively well-off city. I spoke earlier of the horrors of rickets. Well, this is the rickets of our generation. This is our pellagra. This is our polio. This is the plague that cripples lives as swiftly and thoroughly as rickets once twisted the limbs of young Eugene Vann and thousands of other children. Unless *they* are enormously gifted and exceptionally determined, Patricia's children, odds are, will end up just like her. Like a third of all of the children in this nation, they will grow up in poverty. Like one-fifth of all of the children in this nation, they will grow up in ignorance, victims of educational inequity. They will skip school. They will drop out. They will use up far more than their proportional share of resources devoted to emergency health care and educational remediation, not to mention the costs of crime and social service. They will take and take and take, and not give, because the tools for giving have never been given to them.

Already, half of high school seniors cannot read at a level adequate enough to perform even as uncomplicated a task as preparing a nutritionally sound three-course meal. Even more of them cannot write adequately. And these will be our high school graduates. A million young people left school without graduating at all last year. Estimates are that this year's dropout class will cost our country more than \$250 billion in lost earnings and taxes. The greatest number of these children are minorities, living on the edge of economic desperation. In thirty years, the number of poor children — children without adequate food, housing, parenting, medical care; children with every strike against them — promises to rise at an astronomical rate.

This is our plague of the twenty-first century. And no wonder of chemistry or medicine will make it disappear. But, as a society, we must solve these problems. We must find a way to deliver adequate prenatal and postnatal care for teen mothers and developmental screening for babies at risk. A way to educate disadvantaged parents — often children themselves — to facts about health and nutrition. A way to develop low-cost, high-quality day-care arrangements that allow parents to work, and help prepare even the youngest children for school. A way to break the vicious cycle of poverty. But how? And how much? Where is the appropriate place to intervene and offer support? When is it too late?

These are questions that can't be answered in the best laboratory on earth. We must seek the answers in our cities and in our slums, and our reagents will be tape recorders, shoe leather, and human contact. We must begin by restructuring the foundations of our public education system. By making a commitment to disadvantaged students. We must develop creative ways to empower the parents of these youths so that they are partners in their children's education and have the resources and the drive

to complete their own educations.

It is heartening to see an educational reform movement taking hold in this country, a movement that is paying attention to more autonomy and rewards for teachers' innovation and flexibility in curricula, teaching methods, and organization; more parental involvement; and school-based management. This reform movement is critical to higher education for obvious reasons. As educators, we have come increasingly to realize that what a student can achieve as a freshman in college may depend as much on her mother's prenatal diet or her third-grade teacher as it does on the faculty and support systems we can provide.

For that reason, we cannot institute innovations piecemeal — in some districts but not in others; in some states but not in others; with varying degrees of support; with haphazard systems for follow-up and verification. We have tried this patchwork approach before, and it has been a resounding failure. Consistency has been lacking. Accountability has been lacking. Educational reform requires a definite plan, programs that are proven workable, cost-efficient strategies that place research dollars where they can provide maximum, immediate benefit. There are few grand strategies. The social policy research that could help us design and refine those strategies is being carried out in that same fashion, absent the long-term support and commitment we have devoted to basic science.

And yet, everyone, liberal or conservative, agrees that our survival as a nation depends on the reversal of the growing shortage of skilled labor, depends on rescuing the hundreds of thousands of children born to hundreds of thousands of Patricias and changing their paths before it is too late. Our economic future, the future of our great research universities, is inextricably tied to what happens to our poorest children. But, by the same token, the fate of our poorest children is inextricably tied to our

nation's great research universities. And unless we develop some new approaches, some new strategies, some new paradigms, that fate will remain in jeopardy.

To do this, we must focus on the things we do best — educating people and creating knowledge. As I've said, we've done a terrific job of creating knowledge in science, medicine, and engineering. We've done a terrific job of delivering "miracles" of pure science. We've done less well at delivering the "miracles" of social science, though we need these more than ever.

Even given the lack of significant support, our social science researchers have been able to make important contributions. Just last year, UW-Madison faculty members completed ten years of work on a new design for the support of children in divorced families. It began as a bill in the Wisconsin legislature but rapidly became part of the national child support law. Basically, the Child Support Assurance System sets a standard for support for parents. It uses the income tax system to withhold funds from the supporting parent's paycheck. This way, the child is guaranteed certain benefits, regardless of the inclination of the parents. Here at the University of Illinois, Oscar Lewis's work on the culture of poverty was an important impetus to Lyndon Johnson's "Great Society" programs. The University of Illinois is the most accessible campus in the United States for physically disabled people, and the first comprehensive college program for severely disabled students was pioneered here.

But despite these significant accomplishments, I'd bet that the University of Illinois is better known for its soil work and its antidote for botulism poisoning. Of course, these are critical accomplishments. But so is the University of Illinois's research in reading, and its pioneering work in communications regulation, and in arms control, disarmament, and

international security. This kind of research deserves as much recognition and financial support as research in the pure sciences. That change in where society chooses to funnel new research dollars will take vision and political will.

If we are to develop a new paradigm for great research universities, one that provides for more equity among the disciplines, we must recognize the many barriers that exist within our own institutions. Our universities are creatures of tradition. In many ways, their governance and reward systems have remained largely unchanged for 100 years, that same century in which we have seen such profound social change. As I've said, work in the sciences tends to be rewarded and supported to a greater degree by federal aid than work in the social sciences and humanities. Work in a discipline still tends to be valued more highly than work that is interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary, though the latter research is vital if we are to solve the increasingly complex problems facing us in every arena. Research universities tend to be enormous bureaucracies, slow to react, to change, to respond. Finally, research universities, all universities, tend to reflect the values and prejudices of society, many of which are daunting barriers to change.

If we are to develop a new paradigm for great research universities like Illinois and Wisconsin, we must begin to tear down these barriers and build bridges. For example, I admire your significant progress in building "bridges over Green Street," to promote interdisciplinary work between the sciences and social sciences. I also admire your efforts to garner more support for the social sciences and humanities, for the folks "south of Green," especially through the proposal of your Emerging Programs Initiatives Committee to establish an interdisciplinary institute for the study of cultural values and ethics.

This kind of research deserves as much recognition as research in the pure sciences, and as much acclaim. I would love to see us give the equivalent of Nobel Prizes for innovative work in education, sociology, and law, or for innovative work across the disciplines, and not confine such accolades to chemistry, physics, medicine, economics, and literature. But that won't begin to happen until we put our own houses in order. And the place we must start, the strategy that is fundamental to all I have talked about here today, is to address the injustices and inequities that still plague our campuses, our faculties and staffs, the very fiber of our ideological tapestry.

There is a crying need for our great universities to function as a moral force beyond the pragmatic. With our superior ability to draw together the finest minds and put those minds in contact with young people whose own value systems are at the critical point of maturation, we ought to be able to serve as models for a just and sensitive interaction. And too often, we cannot.

We must be on the leading edge of deep and profound change. And while we may be doing better at it, we still are not doing enough. Even with a 500 percent increase in the past decade, still fewer than 5 percent of all practicing engineers are women. Fewer than 2 percent of the nation's nearly 3 million scientists are minorities. Barely one in ten college administrators is a woman; for minorities, the numbers are even smaller. We are not doing a good job of making our own playing field level. For us to deliver equity, we must warm up the climate on our campuses, which has been described as chilly to minorities and women. We must make sure that incidents of racial and sexual harassment get serious and specific attention. We must make sure that ours truly are multiethnic and multicultural curricula that represent the contributions of women and minorities in a per-

manent, prominent way.

We must educate our students to be citizens of the world. We must cultivate the intellectual and social gifts of our own minority and women graduate students and faculty and staff members, not simply compete with other universities for a small pool of superstars. We must change the culture of the university if we hope to enlist the university as a primary tool for changing the culture at large. The momentum of the status quo is strong. Stereotypes persist. Resentments that surround change of this kind go deep. We need to make it clear that making a level playing field for different cultures, ages, genders, and points of view signals no shift in quality, but a striving for greater richness for all faculty members and the students they teach. We must make our stand here and now. We can continue to call ourselves great universities only if we passionately work to eliminate racism and sexism in our universities in our own lifetimes.

Our strategies for change in these areas must also be grounded in research if we are to change institutional behavior. To get the level of support we need, social research must find a way to cast its own shadow, as science has done so magnificently. We have done an exemplary job of making science seem like the great objective friend to humanity that it really is — making science something to be trusted and relied upon without suspicion. Something benevolent and impartial. We must find a way to invest social science research with that same objective sense of good, in a political climate that is bipartisan when it comes to identifying problems but partisan when it comes to identifying solutions. To avert the cataclysms of poverty and educational disadvantage, to point our nation toward a secure, dynamic, internally harmonious century, free of racism and sexism — of all forms of discrimination — we need just such balanced cooperation.

We have a long way to go. The percentage of federal research and

development dollars devoted to the kind of research that could save the future productivity and emotional health of children such as the teenager Patricia and her three babies — or lead us to a new understanding of the resonances of ethnicity in our changing culture, or pick apart the riddle of women's failure to advance in the sciences — comes out to something a little more or less than one-half of 1 percent. And while that figure may be understandable in historical terms, the cost to the future may be beyond reckoning. So it seems that we must undertake a new direction. It is really a very old direction.

What always attracted me to the Wisconsin Idea, years before I ever imagined I would work there, was its value as a national and global model. The idea of society's best and brightest in service to its most needy, irrespective of any particular political philosophy — perhaps that is the most important part, irrespective of any particular political philosophy — is an idea of such great elegance. We need to extend it. We all need to see our gifted researchers set about the work that will eliminate the cripples we face now as thoroughly, if not as swiftly, as our research eliminated juvenile rickets in the past. We need university scientists and university settings to be the proving ground for an explosion of social justice and understanding. We need to give this work the status it demands.

Research universities are in the position to give our nation's lawmakers the tools they need to make decisions. Political maneuvering has too long been in the saddle of social welfare. It is impossible for each successive administration to do its bit of patchwork — a little day care, a little education, a little war on drugs — and then have that patchwork ripped out and started anew by the next occupants of the seats of power. We must build a whole new house of social equity for all of our children. For that to happen, we have to look for a new two-way street of cooperation

between government and the university. If we are to grapple with the big, real social problems, we cannot engage in small struggles. In return for the government's willingness to provide funds in the long-term, sustained way that is necessary, we must provide concise, pragmatic, useful strategies. And policymakers must be willing to listen to our findings when we report them and to act on those findings — just as they would employ a vaccine to fight an epidemic or plant a new grain to fight a famine.

Let's insist that our government take advantage of new initiatives in arms control and disarmament to turn guns back into butter. Better yet, let's turn guns into day care. Tanks into teachers. Nuclear weapons into strong nuclear families. The cost of a single B-1 bomber would represent an extraordinary gift to any one of our campuses; think of the beneficial research on education, for example, that could flow from such a gift.

I don't expect this to be easy. The appeal and bankability of the basic sciences and technology is well established in the hierarchy of research and development; and that is something we cannot afford to lose. We must find ways to create a parallel strength in social research. We must accept the mantle, to an even greater degree than before, of functioning as a think tank for society and as leaders in our society. We already have the tools and the talent. But we need the mandate and the grit.

Breaking the cycle of poverty and dependency, putting down strong new foundations of educational policy, providing for social justice — the knowledge that will meet these extraordinary challenges will, I believe, come out of our great research universities. And there is a rightness and richness in that. If we are lucky, those of us assembled here will enter the prime of our careers during the rebirth of a new dedication to public service, as a cornerstone of higher education. I can think of nothing that would be more exciting. Nothing that would more powerfully fulfill our common

destiny. Because, of course, such a reality would yield more than work on the problems of society.

It would begin anew the old idea of building a concept of public service into the education of every child. This is, of course, not a Wisconsin idea. It is an American idea. Service to others may be the most powerful canon we have inherited. It is indeed a magnificent blueprint. For individuals. For a nation. And for the great research universities of the twenty-first century.

RESPONSE BY MORTON W. WEIR
Chancellor, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Chancellor Shalala has issued a very difficult challenge. And it's a challenge that I think goes to the very heart of our mission as a land-grant university. This campus, like the Madison campus, has a tremendous amount of expertise and talent in the social sciences and in the helping professions. And yet that expertise, as the chancellor has pointed out, is not often applied directly to the solution of societal problems. We do need to turn our knowledge more toward the problems that Chancellor Shalala has mentioned.

Imagine, for example, projects that would systematically share our expertise with people who need that expertise: with parents or with teachers or with service professionals of all kinds. We do a good job, I think, in the original education and training of teachers and of service professionals, and we also do a good job in offering them systematic continuing professional education once they've left our campus. But we do not often develop programs that directly transfer our social science information to society at large in order to help them solve social problems.

Both this campus and the University of Wisconsin-Madison are land-grant institutions, and perhaps what Chancellor Shalala is advocating can have its beginning in a reexamination and a reformulation of that land-grant concept. We have had some preliminary discussions of just that topic on this campus in recent months, and the chancellor's comments, for me, serve to reinforce that need and to prod me to move that along from the back to the front burner.

I was pleased to hear Chancellor Shalala emphasize that our role is to educate and to create knowledge rather than, I assume, to attempt to im-

plement and carry out action programs. Too often when I discuss the university's role in such areas as elementary and secondary education reform or in child nutrition or day care or whatever, people seem to believe that we in the university should be involved directly in the operation of such programs themselves.

That, in my view, is not our role. And I don't think we would do it very well even if we tried. We teach, we discover, we can transfer and disseminate our knowledge, we can demonstrate how an action program might work, or we can help to perfect such a program. But we are not social service agencies, we are not boards of education, and we shouldn't try to be. (John Silber, the president of Boston University, which just took over a Boston school system, probably would disagree with me, but then again he disagrees with almost everybody.)

One thing Chancellor Shalala did not mention is the apparent reluctance of American society to adopt our ideas and put them into place in areas related to social services and to the family. And I hope that she will comment later on that.

In science and technology, our ideas seem to be snapped up. But in the realm of children, youth, and families, our ideas are usually ignored by those who either make policy or provide the support for those kinds of social programs. We boast that we have a child-oriented society, but you are going to have to prove that to me. We know today how to deliver services to preschool children who are at risk, services that will have lifelong beneficial impacts. Estimates show that we can save \$4.50 later for every dollar spent on such programs now. But we will not make that investment. If our engineers had developed a proven method of saving a manufacturer \$4.50 later on his product for every dollar spent on its production, you can bet that that idea would have been adopted and that

dollar would have been spent. Why do we treat our children this way? Why don't we invest now in their futures? Why do we pay zookeepers more than we pay day-care workers?

Chancellor Shalala has mentioned the role of universities in social policy. I think we do need to develop and to press more vigorously our own policy analyses and our own policy proposals so that questions such as those she has raised and I have just raised can find better answers. But in spite of my obvious sympathy for the chancellor's call for greater efforts in helping solve some of these very difficult societal problems, I am concerned about the potential impact of this strategy on our undergraduate programs, and let me tell you what I mean.

There is no question that pressures are mounting for universities to extend their interests in their programs to new problems and new clientele. In most such instances, professors who answer these calls are also answering a call that takes them out of the undergraduate classroom. At the same time, we're being criticized for not giving undergraduate teaching a high-enough priority. Now, I don't believe that we should refuse to answer the call to public service, but we do face a dilemma, and I hope that the public will come to understand that dilemma better than they seem to at the moment.

I agree with Dr. Shalala's contention that we must also move to put our own houses in order insofar as equal opportunities are concerned. I agree also that we must educate our students to be responsible citizens. We must function as a moral force, she says, and our students must come to promote and value diversity. I agree. But I think a little bit of caution is also in order here.

I believe that a major reason that elementary and secondary education is in such difficulty concerning the preparation of students in the

basic academic subjects is that American society expects the schools to teach what parents should be teaching but are not. Here's what one teacher has to say about this: "I feel that many of the things I'm asked to teach should be the responsibility of parents. I feel that parents should teach the child how to behave and to be responsible for his or her own discipline. Teachers should only need to remind the child occasionally about such behavior. I feel the same about social adjustment, interpersonal relationships, sex education, moral character, self-image and guidance, and similar areas." Now that teacher might have added, "And as a result I don't have enough time to teach the basic academic subjects."

Can this happen in universities? Probably not, but when I hear about and indeed when I myself mention the need for the teaching of values, or the need for courses that emphasize racial awareness, or the need to teach our students to be more sensitive to sex stereotypes, or the need for courses in alcohol and drug abuse — whenever those kinds of needs come up — I think of the plight of the public schools and the teacher that I've just quoted; and I resolve that we should take care not to add to our required curricular base in such a way that our coverage of the basic academic subjects is eroded.

I'll end my comments simply by saying that I found Dr. Shalala's call to arms, and I think that's what it is, to be very stimulating indeed. It has energized me to move forward, as I said, in some areas that we've only just been discussing thus far, and I thank you for paying us a visit.

RESPONSE BY P. DAVID PEARSON

Dean, College of Education
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Well, it's tough enough when the president of the University asks you to respond to somebody else's chancellor, but when you also have to respond to your own, that's doubly tough. It brings to mind a story about one of my favorite literary characters, Charlie Brown. Charlie Brown was lying on the baseball mound, looking up at the sky. He and Lucy and Linus and Schroeder were describing what they saw in the cloud formations. Lucy said, "Ah! There's Madame Curie in her laboratory, discovering a great new invention to help save mankind." Linus said, "Look over the western sky — there is Aristotle contemplating the nature of the universe." Schroeder added, "Ah! There, to the south, there's Beethoven slumped over the piano, penning the last few bars of the Ninth Symphony." They all looked at Charlie Brown, who hadn't said anything, and they said, "What do you see, Charlie Brown?" He said, "Well, I was going to say I saw a horsey and a doggie, but I changed my mind."

As dean of a college of education at a major land-grant university, my initial response to Chancellor Shalala's speech is really very simple: What's not to like? Right? Turn tanks into teachers — now, that's *my* kind of slogan. My second response is a bit self-serving for myself and my colleagues in education: I'm glad that Morton Weir and Stan Ikenberry are here to hear Chancellor Shalala's comments. But I want you all to know just how fundamentally I agree with Chancellor Shalala's characterization of the grave social, economic, political, and educational problems faced by our society, our schools, and, indeed, our universities. For example, we cannot continue to pretend that we live in a monocultural society, as many of our

curricular efforts so pretend, when the culture and linguistic data that we get every day remind us of the true multicultural and increasingly multilingual nature of our society. This year, for example, in the state of California, 51 percent of the students enrolled in the public schools are officially classifiable as a member of a racial, cultural, ethnic, or linguistic minority.

Somehow the term *minority* ceases to have any definable meaning in that situation. That figure will be true of the entire country somewhere in the middle to late 1990s. It is also captured in an anecdote about the son of a friend of mine who goes to a famous liberal arts school where they have a new integrated curriculum in Western culture — literature, art, music, philosophy, religion, history, and the like. I asked the son how he liked it, and he said, "Well, I'll tell you what we call it on campus. We call it 'dead white men.' " All three of those terms are important, I think. Let me focus my remarks today on those aspects of Chancellor Shalala's talk that touch on education, particularly public school education, acknowledging the fact that Mort has and Dianne will touch on other aspects of her comments.

By the way, I do want you to know that we in the College of Education have a strong commitment, not only through our educational programs but also through our research and service programs, to applying knowledge to the problems that schools face. As examples, I point to just two of many projects that are under way in the college. One is our Reading Recovery program, in which we have put into place in first-grade classrooms a program of accelerated rather than remedial instruction to help the bottom 20 percent of first-graders — those who come to school not having the kinds of social and academic skills that will help them cope with learning instruction in our classrooms. The idea is to help them acquire those skills in the very first part of first grade so that they can succeed under the normal course of instruction. And also, we work very closely with ten

secondary schools now in the state of Illinois in our Alliance of Essential Schools, which is basically a site-based management and teacher-empowerment approach to problem solving and curriculum development.

Now to Chancellor Shalala's remarks. Chancellor Shalala wants us to restructure education in such a way as to empower parents of disadvantaged, voiceless, and ill-served youth so that they will become partners in education, worry about their children's education, and maybe even think about enhancing their own. I agree with those goals. I think it's a wonderful idea, and I would just point out that, for those of us who are interested in working on the problem (or just even studying it), we have, only 130 miles to the north of us, probably the greatest natural experiment in public policy formation that will ever exist in this century, maybe even in the next century. I refer to the recent restructuring of the Chicago schools to create a local school board for virtually every school in the city. You could study it from many viewpoints — that of a political scientist, a sociologist, an anthropologist, a curriculum specialist, or just about anyone interested in public policy. And there's so much variety within Chicago that you've almost got to be able to find some insight on practices that might transfer to other sites. Chancellor Shalala is encouraged by many aspects of the educational reform movement. Explicitly, she celebrates more teacher autonomy, greater teacher rewards — I'm all for that, even at the university level. Those are goals that I can easily share with her. But let me highlight the cost of the reform movement, a cost that doesn't always get mentioned in the excitement of discussions of curriculum and empowerment. Every state legislature that has passed reform legislation has extracted a promise that schools will be accountable. Every one of those reform bills that I know of came attached with a provision demanding that every student in third, sixth, eighth, and eleventh grade in Illinois and Wisconsin (in Wisconsin, I

think the grades are different) will be assessed on basic curricular areas every so many years. And what has happened to us in our country is, I think, that assessment has become the stumbling block in the reform movement. Now, I was interested to see that, just this last Friday or Saturday, Albert Shanker, in addressing an invitational conference at ETS, said virtually the same thing; he called for a moratorium on the use of standardized assessments of all sorts. And I think what has happened is that we've built a curricular and management system that's based upon openness, involvement, ownership, and empowerment. Yet what we have done is to build an assessment and accountability system that is based upon structure, very specific outcomes, a narrow view of student performance, and, I think, overly simplistic views of how to fix learning when it goes awry. I'm not sure that real reform will ever occur until we somehow bring our curricular aspirations and our assessment practices, which become the operational definitions of our goals, into balance. It seems to me that we cannot tolerate the views and practices in our current assessment systems and expect these to achieve the kinds of goals that we hold. Assessment drives instruction and, I think, unfortunately drives it in all the wrong ways. We see it at state levels. For example, in the state of North Carolina, you're mandated to spend sixty hours getting kids ready for the state tests. I even know of one teacher who was told to stop — to shut down her writing curriculum — to get the kids ready for the state writing test. Somehow that doesn't seem right. At a more personal level, every one of us in this room at one time or another has probably taken the opportunity to take a special course or buy a special book to study for the SAT or the Miller Analogies Test, or the GRE, or maybe even a bar exam. Why? So we know more about the world? No. So we could pass a hurdle that someone has put in our way. Somehow, assessments just for the sake of passing hurdles seem

to me to undermine these noble curricular goals. I think that if we are going to have these kinds of goals, we need to change our assessment systems. To me, there is one and only one criterion that we need to put forward, and that's a criterion of authenticity. Somehow the distance between what it is we expect the person to be able to do and the assessment of it must be minimized.

One point on which Chancellor Shalala and I agree wholeheartedly is minority access. We need a fundamental revitalization of teacher education so as to attract more minority students to the teaching profession. We cannot tolerate the situation we have in this country. You know each year the proportion of minority students increases in our public schools. Each year the proportion of minority students in teacher education at the university decreases. We simply reflect the national trend. Somehow, the notion of a multicultural society is inconsistent with those data. And, consistent with Chancellor Shalala's comments, I recognize that we should try to change the situation here at the University of Illinois, not by stealing minority students from Wisconsin, or even by stealing them from our sister colleges in engineering and business (although sometimes I'm tempted to do just that). But we need to change these situations because I think the future of our multicultural society depends upon a teaching force that represents the diversity that is America. Public education and, by implication, teacher education need to be viewed within this university as a responsibility of all of us. We'll take the responsibility within the College of Education and within the Council on Teacher Education of implementing teacher education. But ultimately, I think, the quality of your programs and your students hinges on a broad base of responsibilities. We're on the brink here at the University of fundamental reform in teacher education. Within a few years, we'll have a program with these characteristics: more rigorous

general education, more extensive preparation in liberal arts and sciences and the fine arts, a longer and more gradual apprenticeship into the teaching profession, greater cooperation with public schools by sharing the responsibility for teacher education with the teachers in the public schools, and a commitment to teachers who teach in the multicultural society. We hope in the process of achieving these reforms to help the University of Illinois achieve the kinds of goals that Chancellor Shalala has so eloquently expressed today. We look forward to participating with you in achieving these goals. We invite you to help us turn tanks into teachers. And you know what — I think that we can probably do that for less than the cost of a B-1 bomber. I think we could probably get by for the price of a 727.

RESPONSE BY DIANNE M. PINDERHUGHES

Associate Professor of Political Science and Acting Director,
Afro-American Studies and Research Program
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

I appreciate the opportunity to offer these comments on the eleventh David Dodds Henry Lecture, given by Donna Shalala. Thinking about the role of the university is something that most of us don't have the opportunity to do on a daily basis. But it is something that must move to the top of our agendas. It's often said that American universities are the best in the world. Our students and especially our graduate students come from all over the world, but as we look at the future undergraduate populations we certainly cannot say the same thing.

First, the populations of these institutions, the students, have been overwhelmingly male and European — although I won't say they are dead — for most of our nation's history. And they have until quite recently been upper class. In the years since World War II — with the advent of the GI Bill, with the development of community colleges, and with the mobilization of resources by the private and public sectors in the years of the civil rights revolution — higher education consumers have become much more heterogeneous economically, and only somewhat more so racially. But that's not enough. With the majority of school-age populations in most of our large cities of the country at this point being black or black and brown, and with the significant portion of the population entering the work force in the near future being black, brown, and Asian, we need to shift our attention from just serving those who knock on the doors to making sure that more of them do knock. David Pearson has already quoted statistics that in California the long-predicted majority-minority status has already occurred. Chancellor Shalala has noted that the role of the university,

especially state universities such as Illinois and Wisconsin, ought to be public service, and I very, very strongly endorse that. Many of us think of the university as ours, a set of activities that we have shaped. The public service role is very different from any of those activities. We operate within units, within our departments, within Political Science, within Afro-American Studies, within Psychology or English or Education. When we make decisions, we are usually responding to the demands of our disciplines. But we live within the larger institution. The institution lives within the larger environment, within the borders of the state. Without some recognition of that social and political reality, we cannot survive, at least in the way we've come to expect in recent years. Chancellor Shalala has called on us — for we are the university — to deal with the fate of our poorest children by educating people and by creating knowledge. Our poorest children too often are black. Our poorest children are also in jeopardy of poverty, of drugs, of family disorganization and disorientation. How does the university take on this different role of increasing the numbers of students and graduates who are black and who are poor? If we just think of this as asking the university to open its doors to teach what it knows, we'll be off to a very poor start, particularly in the areas of the social sciences. As Chancellor Shalala said earlier in the day, it's not just a question of changing minority students to adapt to the university, but it's also changing the university and its faculty to deal with minority students.

What does that mean in this context? It means we have to think of this as a need to create a kind of partnership between the university and those communities that can act to bring about change. Because of the long history of racial segregation and isolation in our history, the black community has a rather extensive and complex network of organizations and associations of all kinds that can be thought of as a means for dealing with

this issue. It was these associations of churches, community groups, professional associations, fraternities, sororities, social clubs, political groups, and charitable associations that organized and successfully brought about the Montgomery bus boycott, that elected Harold Washington mayor of the city of Chicago, that formed the basis for Jesse Jackson's campaign for the presidential nomination, that serve as the mobilizing coalition for the National Coalition on Black Voter Participation. Afro-American Studies had the executive director of that organization on campus the last day or so, and we made sure that she had contact with our students and faculty, and with community leaders as well. Chicago is one of the most well-organized black communities in the country. The voting turnout level for Chicago is literally the highest turnout rate in the country, not just registration; in the 1988 election it was at about 70 percent, which puts it above the national turnout rate for white voters. That's a very unusual level at any time for most of the country. Now, the groups that I'm talking about are not always very wealthy or resource-rich, and these organizations face in a sense the same difficulties that the university does, dealing with problems of drugs, poverty, unemployment, family disorganization. They have to deal with them because they are members of the black community. The reason, however, that I would say this crisis that the country and black communities are facing is more extreme now than it has been in the past is that for the first time the most obvious of the barriers that restricted blacks and black competition in the American economic system are now down. One aspect of segregation is that it kept blacks from focusing on economic status as the most important symbol for well-being. (Of course, people always substitute other things to achieve status. It's not as if that were irrelevant.) Without the larger range of positions and income to which we now have access, we could and often did repress our interests in economic consump-

tion as a symbol of success. One of the unexpected consequences of the success of the civil rights movement is the extent to which the black community has embraced economic and material well-being as a symbol of success. In that embrace, it has become much more difficult to accept poverty. And since the country has not dealt with the economic status of blacks in the way that it has dealt with the political issues involved in discrimination, the gap between rich and poor has literally grown larger between blacks and whites and it has also grown within the black population. The meaning of that poverty now has a much greater consequence than it had in the past. Now, I'm basically calling on a kind of cooperative activity. I'm very supportive of the ideas that Chancellor Shalala has offered us in terms of action in the areas of social science research. However, there must be a kind of cooperative definition and identification of those ideas, and the reason I think it's important is that genuine mobilization cannot occur without attracting the interests of some of these organizations. There is also another aspect, which is that the role of the university toward and its impact on the black community is somewhat different from that seen in the rest of the society. While the university has been seen as a source of light and of education in many parts of the country and in scientific areas, in social scientific areas the university has been the agent of discrimination, and has created notions that have led to the subordination of the black population. And whether people have read the journals or read the books or not, they felt that role quite sensitively in their understanding of how universities operate. So the black community has great ambivalence toward colleges and universities, and we see that in the extent to which it is often difficult to persuade students to think about continuing with education. They often view education as in some way identified with some of those white males that Dave Pearson was talking about. Ambivalence,

however, means that we've got to attract additional students, and attracting them to a place that has been traditionally seen as less than useful for the black community means that the university itself must play a somewhat different role and must assume a different posture in order to carry that out. I think, therefore, there is a public service role for the university that has to be cooperatively developed and it must be developed with the cooperation and involvement of black organizations, which are also concerned about their survival. So in the spirit in which Chancellor Shalala has already created programs to link faculty members and minority students on a one-to-one basis at Wisconsin, I think we can begin to think about re-creating our efforts within this and within other universities. And if we do so by inviting participation, development of ideas, and interaction from black, Hispanic, and Asian organizations, we, the university, and our communities will all be much better for having done so. Thank you.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

WESLEY SEITZ, Professor of Agricultural Economics, UIUC: You mention the reward structure in the university. Suppose someone were to invite you to start over and rewrite the criteria and guidelines for granting promotion and tenure at the University of Wisconsin. What kind of a statement would you come up with that would accomplish your objectives?

CHANCELLOR SHALALA: I don't think I'd come up with a different statement. I think I'd put my money in different pots. I think that's what many of us are going to start doing to reward people who do interdisciplinary work for which their department might not be as enthusiastic as the university because the university sees the interdisciplinary work as combining fields. The language of "what you get promoted and tenured for" certainly could be refined. I think there are lots of professional schools that would like us probably to have more balance between service and teaching and research, but that is rhetoric. The real question is where we put our money and where we reward on the basis of merit. I guess what I would do, and what I think we're going to end up doing, is start having some pots of money that are held back for certain kinds of activities that we deem important. As for undergraduate teaching, I absolutely agree with Mort that the great research universities in this country must get on top of the undergraduate teaching issue and demonstrate not only to the country the quality of undergraduate education that we do, but also to our states because that is their contact with the university. I think it has to do with how we are allocating resources rather than the rhetoric of rewriting the programs. One would be interdisciplinary, one might be for initiatives in undergraduate teaching, etc., but you can reward different things. I tend at

this point in my career to want to buy my way into change even though I obviously haven't perfected the rhetoric. Now that I'm in power, I understand how it works and therefore I'm inclined to pass the money around in different arrangements.

RICHARD SCHACHT, Professor of Philosophy, UTUC: I wonder, Donna, if you could comment on the problem that can arise in the social sciences and humanities if the emphasis in those areas goes into problems that relate to the kinds of concerns you expressed, analogous to the problem that has arisen in some of the sciences that have gone where the money is in terms of their research interests. This tends to have a distorting effect on the overall shape of their disciplines and programs in terms of what is taught and what research is done, particularly if in some of the disciplines in the humanities and social sciences there are only some areas that do have the kind of relevance and can make the kind of impact you're talking about. If that gets a big push, then are you concerned about the implications that that will have for the character of those disciplines on the campus? Should we simply swallow that consequence and say "so be it"? Or do you believe that we need to take care not to allow that kind of unbalancing to occur?

CHANCELLOR SHALALA: I'd like to comment quickly and then to hear Mort's view. I think that the weakness of this lecture in fact was my lack of sensitivity to precisely that issue. What I should have pointed out is the great investment of the federal government that has made an important contribution. That has given the research university in America a special place, and that place is in basic research. I would hope that if we were going to get a serious investment from the federal government it would be in a lot of the basic theoretical work, not just the applied aspects of it. That

would help in the balance. But in addition to that, those of us that lead universities always have to be concerned about the issue you raised. We have to offset where the federal government drives us in terms of its identification of problems. That means we have to make sure that this country has a deep commitment, particularly at the national level, to very basic research. Research that doesn't look as if it's leading anywhere initially often eventually is used. Consequently, we have to be careful that we just don't run around getting money for applied work or for technology transfer that doesn't have the kind of theoretical base to which we make a special contribution. In terms of the balance, since I spent much of my career protecting the classics as a special responsibility, that is really our job in the universities, to make sure in the allocation of resources that we really do have that balance. But I'd also be careful at the federal level. Mort, do you want to add anything?

CHANCELLOR WEIR: I think you've answered it very well. I would only add that what you've brought up may be a long-range concern but in the short run it's certainly no concern of mine. We didn't get worried about science and technology funding skewing our research effort until real money was involved, and it will be a long time before real money is involved in what we're talking about here. I think we can relax for another decade or so.

DEAN PEARSON: Let me just add one point. Some of the schools that have been a part of the Alliance of Essential Schools — a reform initiative by TedSizer concerned with secondary school education — have adopted a program of both teachers' and students' addressing "the classics" in their high school curriculum. For instance, last summer on this campus we had

an absolutely delightful session with teachers in which the curriculum was based upon many of "the classics" that people would read and study in humanities courses. So, I don't think that we should always think that the solution to a "practical problem" is itself a "practical solution."

ROBERT SPITZE, Professor of Agricultural Economics, UIUC: I'm quite inspired by hearing at least two of our speakers very directly talk about a revisiting of the land-grant mission and land-grant notion. All of the speakers, I think, alluded to it; and this to me comes at a time when I hear that the public university is taking on the trappings of the private university and the private university is taking on the trappings of the public university. So, it appears to me that we are at a very critical stage. Do we want to preserve something like a land-grant university? Is this something that is distinctive and unique? Or is it essentially a university that gradually becomes very similar to our major private universities, relying primarily on sponsored research and so forth? So when I hear you talk about the revisiting of the land-grant mission, what does this mean? Do you have any thoughts about how this can be set off and inspiring to faculty members in economics, in political science, in English, in psychology? How can faculty members get hold of this notion that this is the challenge for us?

CHANCELLOR SHALALA: I guess that what we're saying is that the uniqueness of the American university is really the land-grant idea, that the public service idea is our contribution to higher education in this world. And I guess you're absolutely right. We're headed down this road unless some of us pull back a little bit and stop and take a look again at where we're going. You can tell it in the competitive salary battles that we're playing. I recently had a long conversation with Senator Barbara Mikulski of Maryland about

the testimony she heard at the National Science Foundation from the public institutions. It shocked her. She couldn't tell the difference, I think (though she didn't say it quite that clearly), between the private and public institutions. Many of us feel very strongly that we have to get back to our roots, but there are new roots. The rôle of the land-grant university, the role of the great public research university, is not the same series of themes that we had. I guess what we're doing is redefining that. I think most of us are very conscious of the way in which we look precisely like a private institution. Particularly in our graduate programs you cannot tell the difference between us. For me, and I'm sure it is for Mort, this is not just rhetoric. This is our attempt to reconceptualize our institutions at this point in time to make sure we both have our feet firmly planted and understand the historical perspective from whence we came.

PROFESSOR PINDERHUGHES: Well, I think one way in which we can see some efforts already in operation to make some of these changes, although the people doing them don't necessarily think of them in these broad terms, is to look to a number of experiments or special programs that have been created. Many of you are actually involved in one of them, the CIC institutions' Summer Research Opportunities Program. It is, I think, proving to be a very successful program in which a number of our students have become involved in working with the faculty to see what it's like to be a faculty member on a day-to-day basis. That program has been run for about three years by Elaine Copeland, associate dean of the Graduate College, on this campus, and it has expanded every year. I think they generally have an annual conference in the summer and also during the school year so that we can see how they've done. I guess I should say that that program is specifically for minority students — black and Hispanic

students. But the concept of a direct person-to-person interaction between students and faculty members is one that Chancellor Shalala is using on a broader basis at Wisconsin. She talked about every minority freshman entering this year having a faculty mentor; that idea of more direct contact seems to me a very good one.

PRESIDENT IKENBERRY: I can't resist the temptation to respond also to your question, Bob. I think there is a question of balance in higher education in this country. There needs to be a common academic thread that transcends the question of institutional sponsorship. At the same time, there is an institutional uniqueness that grows out of a particular sponsorship. You can look at that balance in the liberal arts colleges of our country, many of which have had a religious sponsorship while at the same time maintaining the common academic thread that binds all of us together. Or look at the Rockefeller University, for example, which has a whole different source of sponsorship; or other private universities that must exist by courting major donors and raising several millions of dollars a year in order to be able to survive. Each develops a particular orientation in the direction of its sponsorship. I suspect it is a fact that public universities such as ours have not had a very thoughtful, penetrating debate among the faculty and administration to ask ourselves what peculiar obligations and qualities of self-interest, if you will, or societal obligation attend being a public and/or land-grant university in our society today. There are very real elements, I think, that need to be discussed and that have been discussed in ages past but may need to be reinvented and rediscussed in our generation.

SUSAN LAMB, Associate Professor of Physics, UIUC: I had a question concerning the implementation of some of the excellent ideas you've put

forward, Chancellor Shalala. When it comes down to it, it's going to be individual faculty members persuading other individual faculty members to actually get on and do something. And in order to do that they need support from the university and particularly their departments. Many departments are supportive of interdepartment pursuits and intercollege pursuits, and yet there is no obvious funding mechanism that I'm aware of at this university for supporting faculty members in these pursuits, such as a leave of absence from regular teaching duties. I wondered if at Wisconsin you had thought about the actual implementation of your ideas in terms of funding individual faculty members. Perhaps Chancellor Weir would respond also.

CHANCELLOR SHALALA: We just finished a big futures report. One of the major recommendations was that we really needed to put some resources into interdisciplinary activities to free faculty members up. While I can't tell you directly now what the mechanism is, both the dean of our graduate school and our vice-chancellor for academic affairs are beginning to work with it to try to figure out how they're going to do it. They are both very much committed to it. We also do have a vehicle for certain kinds of work. Those patents on vitamin D produce something called the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation, which makes Wisconsin relatively rich compared to other kinds of institutions. We've used those resources for younger faculty members, particularly, to encourage them to do different sorts of things, and that has been a gift that really has been able to maintain Wisconsin's ability to grow its own, for example. But I don't think there's any secret that this is all a variation on the theme, and I think we're all thinking in the same terms. Mort really has been a leader in coming up with some of these ideas. Some of us are simply stealing ideas from Illinois.

CHANCELLOR WEIR: We are reviving the Program of Study in a Second Discipline. It perked along for a while, then became moribund. It's being revived. If [Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs] Bob Berdahl were here, he could tell you how many individuals we will be funding in this program in the coming year. It is a small number, but still the attempt is there. We have attempted to fund interdisciplinary programs on this campus to a considerable degree. Funding individuals who hope to make some shifts in their own careers has been more difficult.

EDWARD DENISON, continuing education student, UIUC: My question is, How is Wisconsin reaching into the community, and what agency within the university is playing the role of the boundary spanner? How are you getting to the practical applications?

CHANCELLOR SHALALA: Well, like everybody else does, through extension programs, extensive extension programs. We have faculty members, of course, like this institution does, that have combination appointments in a variety of different disciplines, but we're also looking for new models. Dianne talked very sensitively about if you want to reach the minority communities, you have to understand those social structures and the institutions within the minority communities, and it requires a different kind of configuration. We are developing new strategies to do that kind of outreach that will be helpful. You know we have had extension resources for many years. Very few of them have been focused on social policy except in our school of education, where we, like this institution, are deeply involved in individual schools trying out new methods. I am increasingly trying to get scholars from other disciplines to work with schools with our education people. We have scientists who are working on some projects

with our science education people and trying new kinds of configurations. But I think all of us are looking for those new formats.

KENNEDY HILL, Professor of Educational Psychology, UIUC: I have two related questions that you've been sort of referring to. There is no question federal funding and a lot of state funding is really going to technology and science now and very little to social science. How do we go about changing that? And, how receptive is the society to what you are articulating, which I think you've articulated extremely well? Assuming we do come up with knowledge and we can train people and we can come up with solutions, will society accept them? Will political leaders accept them? There have been several comments on the panel along those lines, but how do we go about convincing the political leaders in terms of resources that really they should begin to swing back to people, that you can have the best technology in the world but you have to have people to run it? What are some of your more specific ideas, or perhaps anyone on the panel, as to how we start getting the resource imbalance back to social science and people? What are going to be some of the problems of society accepting it and being willing to implement it?

CHANCELLOR SHALALA: Mort sort of raised that issue, too, because he said, Why is it that the findings of social scientists aren't used, aren't applied? One of our problems in this society is everyone thinks he or she is a social scientist. And therefore we have trouble getting these things accepted in terms of why we are not moving forward with some of these things. Dianne raised some of that. You know children don't vote in this country, particularly our poorest children. They don't contribute to campaigns — there are real good political reasons that children don't have political clout. But spe-

cifically, on the issue of social scientist work, I have just spent five years of my life, and it was a lot of work, working with the Committee for Economic Development, which is the organization of the 200 biggest CEOs in the country, and we did two major reports on education. Al Shanker was on the panel too, but mostly what we education people did is sort of sit back and let the CEOs go at it, because we decided that if those reports were going to have an impact, they had to have a businessman's slant. What struck me, and struck them as they began to ask questions about what we knew and what we didn't know, is how little R and D there is in education. When they thought in terms of what kind of data they moved forward on when they made decisions and how much information we needed to have, they were struck by the lack of evaluation mechanisms, the resources for evaluation, and the fact that we had expertise but we didn't have long-term money to get answers to questions. I think that if R and D is ever going to have a generation, a new coalition of supporters, it may well come from that business community. And I have been interested in some time in trying to put together a coalition of some of the business people. It may not be in this generation of politicians in Washington, but business people have a real different slant on the importance of human resources, on how you invest in people, and what kind of evaluation mechanisms and long-term research you need, so that we may in fact have a different kind of political coalition to put together for our R and D and the social sciences that would have an impact.

DEAN PEARSON: It seems to me that we've got a lot of evidence over the past 80 or 100 years that the sort of straightforward dissemination model, the technology transfer model — in which we've tried to go into schools, for example, and say, "Here's the way to do this or that or the other" — has not

really served the schools well. I also don't think it's done a lot of good for the universities that have tried to do it. The notion of "I'm from the university and I'm here to help" has not worked well. What we have to remember is that most of these ideas involve values. Because of that, what you really want people to do is to adapt rather than adopt new ideas, because if they adopt them and they don't work immediately, probably what they'll do is throw them out and say, "Well, that's just another one of those ideas from the university." So seeing your ideas being adapted, even eroded slightly, is probably a good rather than a bad kind of thing. The better role for us to play in these educational, and I suspect some of the social, issues, too, is one of an intellectual, an intellectual academic "go-fer." I don't think that we can pretend to know exactly the nature of the problem. I don't think that we can pretend to know what the solution should be, but one of the things that we ought to be able to bring to public schools is the benefit of the extra time and energy that we have to devote to scholarship; and that ought to be, if you will, the resource that we bring to the situation. Now that requires a collaboration. You can't do it just by writing books or pamphlets. You have to go out and work with people in order to engage in that kind of problem solving. My guess is, having failed miserably at the other approach, that this approach probably holds more promise for us.

PROFESSOR PINDERHUGHES: I tend to think of a somewhat different constituency when I think of these kinds of changes. I think one role the university has, particularly as a land-grant institution, is to talk to our legislators about social science issues. This is because the kind of economy we have had, and the kind of values we have had about what's appropriate for the state to be involved in, has meant that many areas that Chancellor Shalala talked about today as a kind of given are debatable in the larger

society. They are political questions. They are partisan questions in the rest of the society. And her call for more basic research allows for there to be more open discussion about what's appropriate and for the consideration of broader kinds of policy recommendations than I think we've been able to consider for about ten years.

BRIAN HOPKINS, student member, Illinois Board of Regents: Chancellor Weir had earlier mentioned a classic dilemma that we in higher education enjoy debating: the conflict between more attention to undergraduate education versus more attention to the broader topics of research. But Chancellor Shalala's vision brought to my mind another classic dilemma that we face in higher education, and that is the seeming conflict between the roles of a university. Should we be more of a career training institute, or should we be more providers of a traditional well-rounded liberal education? When you talk about our mission of public service, particularly to the more disadvantaged segments of our society, you'll often hear it said that we need to move more toward that model of a career training institute and that a degree should be less of a symbol of broadened horizons and more of currency that can be spent for access to the job market. How do we respond to that argument?

CHANCELLOR SHALALA: Two responses. First, I think Mort and I are both preparing and educating young people for their third position, not for their first. That means that we have to anticipate the future, and that really is the role of a first-class university. Second, we have to do all of the above; neither the University of Illinois nor the University of Wisconsin has a choice. We are research universities of enormous depth; we don't have the luxury of selecting out four or five areas in which we can emphasize this.

The second- and third-level universities can do that, but to have schools of business that are of the first rank, we have to have first-rank departments in economics and computer science. It is the depth of these schools that distinguish them as among the great universities in this country, and we have to do all of those things. We have to balance our deep commitment to undergraduate education with our need to play a role in creating knowledge, whether it is in social policy or in science policy. If we could make any point to our legislators and to our state boards of higher education, it is to understand that we really are quite different from a lot of other higher educational institutions because we need the depth and breadth to be one of the selective institutions in this country.

THE DAVID DODDS HENRY LECTURES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

"The Administration of Higher Education in an Era of Change and Conflict," by Clark Kerr, October 1972

"Can We Maintain Quality Graduate Education in a Period of Retrenchment?" by David Riesman, April 1975

"The Administration of Education for the Health Professions: A Time for Reappraisal," by John R. Hogness, April 1976

"The Education of Administrators for Higher Education," by Harlan Cleveland, April 1977

"Socially Imposed Costs of Higher Education," by Howard R. Bowen, April 1978

"Quality and Equality in Health Professions Education and Service," by Lloyd C. Elam, April 1979

"How We Talk and How We Act: Administrative Theory and Administrative Life," by James G. March, September 1980

"The Liberal Arts Revisited," by Hanna Holborn Gray, October 1981

"The University Presidency: Comparative Reflections on Leadership," by Martin A. Trow, October 1984

"Innovation and Tradition in Higher Education," by John B. Slaughter, October 1985

"Mandate for a New Century: Reshaping the Research University's Role in Social Policy" by Donna E. Shalala, October 1989